DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 352 HE 001 266

AUTHOR	Jenks, R. Stephen; And Others
TITLE	The Student Role in Faculty Selection, Evaluation And Retention.
INSTITUTION	New Hampshire Univ., Durham.
PUB DATE	10 Nov 69
NOTE	7p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Faculty Evaluation, *Governance, *Governmental Structure, *Higher Education, *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*New Hampshire University

ABSTRACT

Arguing that it is difficult to discuss the student's role in faculty selection, evaluation and retention outside the broader context of the student's role in decision making (see Jenks, HE 001 251), the author describes the new unicameral system at the University of New Hampshire and some of the processes the institution went through in achieving the reorganization. The Committee on Government Organization found that most institutions that had recently included students in the governance process had done so by adding students to existing decision-making bodies. They decided that merely adding students to the Old University Senate "would leave an already inefficient and unwieldy body even more so" and thus a complete restructuring was necessary. Two convocations and many open meetings were held to explain the details and purposes of the proposed changes before they were approved by a referendum, the president, and the board of trustees. The new Senate held its first meeting in June 1969. (JS)

ED035352

PRESENTATION TO COUNCIL FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Panel: The Student Role in Faculty Selection, Evaluation and Retention

R. Stephen Jenks, Chairman
Committee on Government Organization

It is difficult to discuss the role of the student in matters of faculty selection, evaluation, and retention outside the broader context of the student's role in university decision making. Last year, the University of New Hampshire attacked the entire question of the form of university governance, with particular attention to the student role in such governance. In a relatively short period of ten months, we restructured the University government and built the new unicameral system, based on equal representation of faculty and students. I will discuss the rationale behind the decision for restructuring, the new government structure itself, and a little of the process we went through in achieving the reorganization.

Ideally, the three major groups in a university - faculty, students, and administrators - work together toward a set of clearly identified educational goals. Practically, the ideals are often frustrated by a lack of agreed-upon goals, and by separating the three major groups into competing power groups. Both of these causes of frustration existed at U.N.H. The Committee on Government Organization recommended a new governmental structure which we felt would help to draw the University together, provide participation and fair representation for all members of the University community, and operate more efficiently than the old governmental structures. We proposed a unicameral university government structure, with supporting student and faculty caucuses. The University Senate is the only legislative body for university-wide policy. We felt that any tricameral system, which retained a student government structure, a faculty governing body, and a third university senate would inevitably get into political disputes which would tend further to separate students from faculty, and both groups from the administration. In exploring alternate tricameral models we went so far as to design one in

HE001266

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

which there would be three bodies, each having members of the faculty, student body, and the administration, but concerned with different subject matter: one body would be concerned with academic affairs, one body with non-academic affairs, and the third with university policy. It turns out to be exceedingly difficult to separate in any difinitive manner those subjects which are exclusively the academic and those which are exclusively non-academic from those which affect the overall university.

Following detailed exploration of various tricameral models, the committee began to work on developing a unicameral model which would have caucuses, thereby allowing faculty members to meet by themselves and the students to meet by themselves on various matters. However, all decision making would be done in a single body - the University Senate. The following is a description of the structure of the new government system at U.N.H.

University Senate Structure and Rationale

1. Composition. The total size of the University Senate would be 77. There would be 30 Students*, 30 Faculty, 12 Administrators* and 5 Graduate Students as voting Senators. Faculty members would be elected for three-year staggered terms without consecutive re-election. Student members would be elected for one-year terms with re-election privileges. The Senate would elect one of its members to be Chairman and to preside at all meetings. He would be elected at the first meeting of each newly elected Senate.

2. Executive Council. The work of the Senate would be organized by an internal Executive Council whose membership would include the President of the University, as Chairman, the Academic Vice-President, the Chairman of the Faculty Caucus,

* For the 30 Student Senators, 29 would be elected by district and the 30th would be the President of Student Government, ex officio. All 12 Administrators would be ex officio voting members and would be the following: The President of the University, all Vice Presidents (4), the Deans of all Colleges and Schools (6), the Dean of Students.

two elected faculty Senators, the President of Student Government, the Chairman of the Student Caucus and one elected student Senator, and the Chairman of the Graduate Student Caucus. The Executive Council would serve the President of the University in an advisory capacity, recommend nominations toall University Senate committees, assign work to committees, prepare the agenda for Senate meetings, and take actions on an interim basis between Senate meetings,over vacation periods, etc.

3. Caucuses of the Senate. Senators representing faculty and undergraduate students shall respectively constitute the Faculty Caucus and the Student Caucus of the University Senate. Each spring, each Caucus shall elect one of its members to serve as Chairman. The Chairman of the Caucus shall serve on the Executive Council of the University Senate, and shall preside at meetings of their respective Caucuses. After consulting with their Forum, the Student of Faculty Caucus may decide by a 2/3 majority vote that an item on the University Senate agenda should be decided by an exceptional majority because of its gravity. After voting on such an item, if a 2/3 majority of the Caucus is achieved, the Caucus involved may require that any University Senate action on that item be taken only by the exceptional majority of 2/3 of the University Senate present at the next Senate meeting.

4. Faculty and Student Forums. The Faculty Forum shall consist of all faculty on the Durham campus, all of whom will be free to speak, to initiate resolutions, and to vote. The Chairman of the Faculty Caucus shall preside at meetings of the Forum. In order that all members of the faculty may be heard in person on matters of concern to them, the Faculty Forum shall meet once a month, normally on the Monday preceding the monthly meeting of the University Senate. All Faculty Senators shall attend meetings of the Faculty Forum as a part of their duties. Resolutions or other expressions of opinion of the Forum are advisory and will be transmitted to the Senate by members of the Faculty Caucus.

The Student Forum shall consist of all students on the Durham campus. All students will be free to speak, to initiate resolutions, and to vote. The President of Student Government shall preside at meetings of the Forum. All student Senators

shall attand meetings of the Student Forum as a part of their duties. In order that all students may be heard in person on matters of concern to them, the Student Forum shall meet once a month, normally on the Monday preceding the monthly meeting of the University Senate. Resolutions or other expressions of opinion of the Forum are advisory and will be transmitted to the Senate by members of the Student Caucus.

5. Election Procedures. All University Senators would be elected from single member districts of approximately equal size. Faculty Senators would be elected by the following procedure: (omitted)

6. Powers and Duties of the University Senate. The University Senate is the legislative body of the entire University at Durham, subject always to the approval of the Board of Trustees. The University Senate has legislative jurisdiction in all matters of student government, faculty government and educational policy. Those organizations supported by the Student Activity Tax would be under the direct jurisdiction of the Student Caucus and the Cabinet of Student Government. The University Senate could decide to delegate other specific kinds of jurisdiction to the Faculty and Student Caucuses at its discretion.

9. Rationale. The rationale involved in arriving at the proposal outlined above is explained by two main arguments. First, the proposed unicameral system gives maximum participation to all members of the University Community on a fair and equitable basis. Because there are no exclusive domains, all members of the University Community have the right to express their opinions in the same body (University Senate), in private bodies (the Caucuses), or both, on any matter they feel strongly about. Students are provided a much stronger voice and much wider participation in all areas of University government and decision-making. Second, the unicameral system is more efficient than the present University Senate/Student Senate structure in several areas. Rules changes can be argued and decided upon in a single University Senate meeting rather than being debated at least twice as is now the case. Furthermore, because the Faculty and Student Caucuses and Forums will have met prior to each meeting of the University Senate, faculty

and student sentiment on proposed legislation will be known on a broader base than at present, and Senators will know whether the issue warrants a 2/3 majority (exceptional) type of action in University Senate. Additionally, a unicameral system should allow a reduced committee structure in the University. Under the new proposal, University Senate would replace the present tangle of overlapping committees with a unified committee structure representing all members of the University Community.

Finally, there is an organizational argument favoring the proposed unicameral system. (The Committee on Government Organization feels that tugs of war between legislative bodies would hurt the overall development of the University.) The unicameral structure in and of itself will tend to unite the University community by bringing the three major groups <u>together</u> more thoroughly. The unicameral structure promotes the building of constructive, shared goals and programs for the whole University as well as promoting trust between students, faculty, and administrators.

******

The Committee on Government Organization was established in May of 1968 by the Faculty Council of the old University Senate. The Faculty Council had become concerned that there were no students on the University Senate, and felt that not only did they have a right to be members of the Senate, but that if the Senate itself did not take action to include students, they would be forced to be in the position of responding to student demands before much more time passed. The committee decided very early that merely adding a number of students to the old University Senate would leave an already inefficient and unwieldly body even more so. Therefore, it was decided to restructure the University Senate in a more fundamental way. The first task involved writing to a large number of colleges and universities throughout the United States and Canada, whose characteristics were not too dissimilar from those of U.N.H. We found that most universities which had recently added students to their decision-making bodies had done so on the add-on basis mentioned above.

However, the idea of the unicameral system came from several universities in Canada which have gone to a so-called "one tier" system of government which closely resembles the unicameral system.

In the fall of 1968 the committee (which initially included 2 students, 2 faculty members, and 2 administrators) was expanded to 13 members, including 4 faculty members, 4 administrators, 4 students, and one graduate student. Most of the people who were added to the committee had volunteered to serve after hearing about the committee's work in a campus newspaper article. In late October and early November the campus was subjected to several mild demonstrations, during which the demonstrators demanded representation in all forms of university decision-making and governance, along with demands that R.O.T.C. be banned from the campus and similar standard demands. A convocation was held at which more than 80 percent of the entire student body was told what efforts were already underway in response to university-wide concerns, many of which had been highlighted by the recent demonstrations. Following the convocation, the Committee on Government Organization made it a point to have frequent open meetings at which any member of the university community was free to speak, make any suggestions to the committee, ask questions of the committee, etc.

A preliminary tricameral system was reported to the university community in the campus newspaper and in public meetings in January of 1969, to get broad-based reactions. Many people were dissatisfied and the dissatisfaction ranged from those students who felt that anything less than 50 percent of the vote was inadequate, to those faculty members who felt that anything more than tokenism was giving the university to the students. Because we discovered that the vast majority of people on the university campus were not familiar with the intricacies of university governance, nor with the implications of various alternative structures, we decided that we would put together a single, well thought through government structure and propose that as our only recommendation and ask for a referendum on which people would be voting for the old University Senate or the new proposal, rather than choosing between a number of new proposals. A university-wide convocation was held in early March, at which time the

proposed unicameral system was explained in detail to those in attendance and copies of a committee report were distributed widely. A referendum was held two weeks later, at which time the students voted for the new proposal by an overwhelming majority, and the faculty voted for the new proposal by a narrow majority.

Armed with the committee's report and the results of the referendum, the President suggested to the Board of Trustees that they adopt the new unicameral system, and the Trustees voted to do so. Elections to the new University Senate were held in May, and the Senate held its first meeting in June. So far this fall it has been operating relatively smoothly.